

PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL

Complete and send this form, together with applicable fee(s), to: **Mail** Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 or **Fax** (571)-273-2885

INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be used for transmitting the ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). Blocks 1 through 5 should be completed where appropriate. All further correspondence including the Patent, advance orders and notification of maintenance fees will be mailed to the current correspondence address as indicated unless corrected below or directed otherwise in Block 1, by (a) specifying a new correspondence address; and/or (b) indicating a separate "FEE ADDRESS" for maintenance fee notifications.

CURRENT CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (Note: Use Block 1 for any change of address)

21171

7590

09/01/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
 SUITE 700
 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
 WASHINGTON, DC 20005



Note: A certificate of mailing can only be used for domestic mailings of the Fee(s) Transmittal. This certificate cannot be used for any other accompanying papers. Each additional paper, such as an assignment or formal drawing, must have its own certificate of mailing or transmission.

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission

I hereby certify that this Fee(s) Transmittal is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop ISSUE FEE address above, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-2885, on the date indicated below.

(Depositor's name)
(Signature)
(Date)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/429,920	10/29/1999	ATSUSHI WATANABE	392.1666/JDH	6526

TITLE OF INVENTION: IMAGE PROCESSING APPARATUS FOR ROBOT

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	NO	\$1400	\$0	\$0	\$1400	12/01/2006

EXAMINER	ART UNIT	CLASS-SUBCLASS
LU, TOM Y	2624	382-141000

1. Change of correspondence address or indication of "Fee Address" (37 CFR 1.563).

- ☐ Change of correspondence address (or Change of Correspondence Address form PTO/SB/122) attached.
☐ "Fee Address" indication (or "Fee Address" Indication form PTO/SB/47; Rev 03-02 or more recent) attached. Use of a Customer Number is required.

2. For printing on the patent front page, list

- (1) the names of up to 3 registered patent attorneys or agents OR, alternatively,
 (2) the name of a single firm (having as a member a registered attorney or agent) and the names of up to 2 registered patent attorneys or agents. If no name is listed, no name will be printed.

1. **STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

2. _____

3. _____

3. ASSIGNEE NAME AND RESIDENCE DATA TO BE PRINTED ON THE PATENT (print or type)

PLEASE NOTE: Unless an assignee is identified below, no assignee data will appear on the patent. If an assignee is identified below, the document has been filed for recordation as set forth in 37 CFR 3.11. Completion of this form is NOT a substitute for filing an assignment.

(A) NAME OF ASSIGNEE

FANUC LTD

(B) RESIDENCE: (CITY AND STATE OR COUNTRY)

YAMANASHI, JAPAN

00000153 09429920

1400.00 JP

Please check the appropriate assignee category or categories (will not be printed on the patent): ☐ Individual ☒ Corporation or other private group entity ☐ Government

4a. The following fee(s) are submitted:

- ☒ Issue Fee
☐ Publication Fee (No small entity discount permitted)
☐ Advance Order - # of Copies _____

4b. Payment of Fee(s): (Please first reapply any previously paid issue fee shown above)

- ☒ A check is enclosed.
☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.
☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s), any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number **19-3935** (enclose an extra copy of this form).

5. Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)

- ☐ a. Applicant claims SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27. ☐ b. Applicant is no longer claiming SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27(g)(2).

NOTE: The Issue Fee and Publication Fee (if required) will not be accepted from anyone other than the applicant; a registered attorney or agent; or the assignee or other party in interest as shown by the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Authorized Signature

Christopher P. Mitchell

Date

Nov 9, 2006

Typed or printed name

CHRISTOPHER P. MITCHELL

Registration No.

54,946

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.311. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.



Docket No.: 392.1666

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Atsushi WATANABE, et al.

Serial No. 09/429,920

Group Art Unit: 2624

Confirmation No. 6526

Filed: October 29, 1999

Examiner: Tom Y. Lu

For: IMAGE PROCESSING APPARATUS FOR ROBOT

COMMENTS REGARDING STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner provided a Statement of Reasons for Allowance in which the Examiner indicated that some of the claims were allowed based on certain features.

MPEP §1302.14 states, in part:

Where specific reasons are recorded by the examiner, care must be taken to ensure that statements of reasons for allowance (or indication of allowable subject matter) are accurate, precise and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow upon the claims. The examiner should keep in mind the possible misinterpretations of his or her statement that may be made and its possible effects.

The Examiner characterizes certain features of various claims. However, the Examiner has not recited the appropriate language for the claims as pending and allowed in the application.

By way of example, the Examiner states:

Independent claim 8 defines features of displaying the converted image data on a teaching pendant used for generating, editing a robot program and used for operating said robot, wherein said displaying displays the image data and indication for manipulation for image processing simultaneously, or allows a user to enter a

switching mode or a superposition mode. These features in combination with other features in claim 8 are not taught or suggested by the art of record.

However, claim 8 simply recites:

8. A method, comprising:
fetching from a camera image data of an image of a workpiece to be worked on by a robot;
storing image data from the camera or intermediate image data obtained in a stage of image processing; and
converting image data from the camera, the image data from the camera stored in a memory, or the intermediate image data into a gray scale or a color scale; and
displaying the converted image data on a teaching pendant used for generating, editing a robot program and used for operating said robot,
wherein said displaying displays the image data and indication for manipulation for image processing simultaneously, or allows a user to enter a switching mode or a superposition mode.

The foregoing is merely meant to be exemplary, and does not point out all of the discrepancies between the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance and the claimed features of the currently pending claims.


It is further submitted that the claims speak for themselves and should not be interpreted based on the Examiner's characterizations of same. It is also submitted that the claims provide their own best evidence as to the reason for allowance.

In summary, it is submitted that the Examiner's Statement raises "possible misinterpretations" (M.P.E.P. §1302.14) and is therefore improper.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov. 9, 2006

By: 
Christopher P. Mitchell
Registration No. 54,946

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501